

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fujimori (US 7,009,942) in view of Fellman (US 6,980,990). Applicants traverse the rejection based on the following comments.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname;

selecting a nickname for the recognized first device from a recommended nickname table which is also connected to the network; and

registering information regarding the selected nickname.

The claimed method, thus, sets forth, *inter alia*, recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname.

The Examiner asserts, however, that column 8, lines 27-33, of Fujimori teaches automatically assigning a name specific to an apparatus when the apparatus was connected to the mLAN system. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Fujimori teaches recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname because in Fujimori a name is assigned when the apparatus is connected to a network LAN. Thus, the Examiner asserts that if a name has already been assigned to an apparatus before it is connected

to a LAN, there is no need to assign a name when the apparatus is connected to the LAN.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position.

Column 8, lines 27-33, of Fujimori more accurately states that "in a line name column, the line name specific to each apparatus is displayed [in FIGS. 4A and 4B] which was automatically assigned when the apparatus was connected to the mLAN system." More specifically, Fujimori teaches that the line name is assigned to each physical terminal of the connection apparatus from the view point of the mLAN system, such that a user can intuitively understand that data transmitted from which apparatus is received at which apparatus, when the connection state (list) is displayed (col. 10, lines 27-32). Thus, Fujimori does not teach assigning a name to the apparatus (i.e., the alleged first device) but instead teaches that a line name is assigned to the physical terminal of the connection apparatus, the line name being specific to the apparatus so that user can recognize the terminal of the connection apparatus being connected to the apparatus. For example, each line name is an identifier for identifying each of a plurality of lines used on the mLAN (col. 10, lines 33-37). Again, the line name is not a name assigned to the actual apparatus which the Examiner regards as the claimed first device.

Figures 7A to 7C of Fujimori also illustrate each assigned line name (left column) and a physical terminal name corresponding to each line (right column) (col. 9, lines 59-63). In other words, the physical terminal name of the connection apparatus (i.e., the line name) is identified as corresponding to a physical terminal of the device apparatus, such that a user can recognize a connection between two terminals (col. 9, lines 10-17 and 59-63).

Furthermore, Fujimori teaches that a line name is "specific" to each apparatus because only a terminal of the connection apparatus and a line therebetween is connected to a terminal of

the apparatus. Thus, the terminal of the connection apparatus which is identified by the line name is merely specific to the apparatus it is connected to. For example, Figures 4A, 4B, 5A and 5B are lists showing the connection state of the mLAN system and the lists are displayed in accordance with the apparatus information and connection information (col. 7, lines 61-66). Figure 4A, for example, shows an apparatus name “MD1” as a name of the apparatus connected to the connection apparatus. However, MD1 is provided by the apparatus itself and is not a name generated by the connection apparatus (see col. 3, lines 45-49). Similarly, apparatus MD2 and apparatus MD3 each have their own names. MD1, MD2 and MD3 are merely examples and could be any name that is provided by the apparatus. Fujimori does not teach or suggest that an apparatus being connected to the connection apparatus is connected without a nickname. Instead, Fujimori clearly teaches that the apparatus has a name which it provides as apparatus information and that associations with the connection apparatus are created and assigned thereafter.

Furthermore, as previously argued in the Response filed on January 2, claim 1 is directed to “automatically determining a device’s nickname.” Fellman plainly states the user is able to select one of more names from the table for registration. Thus, neither reference, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests automatically determining a nickname for a device which is connected to the network without a nickname, specifically, by selecting a nickname for the recognized device from a recommended nickname table.

In view of the above, Fujimori, alone or in combination with Fellman, does not teach or suggest recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname; selecting a nickname for the recognized first device from a recommended nickname

table which is also connected to the network; and registering information regarding the selected nickname.

Similarly, Applicants submit that independent claims 7, 9, 13 and 14 are patentable for analogous reasons. Further, Applicants submit dependent claims 2-6, 8, 10, 15 and 16 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 7, 9 and 14.

B. Claims 5, 6, 7, 8 and 16


Regarding claims 5, 6, 7, 8 and 16, the Examiner asserts the claimed features are inherent. Specifically, the Examiner states, “[t]hat is exactly why newly connected device requires name assignment so as to be uniquely identified in a network.” However, as noted above, the asserted combination of Fujimori and Fellman fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. Since Fujimori does not teach assigning a name to an apparatus connected to the network, Fujimori fails to teach recognizing a first device that has been connected to a network without being assigned a nickname and selecting a nickname for the recognized first device. Thus, Fujimori, alone or in combination with Fellman, fails to teach or suggest the specific combination of steps recited in claims 5, 6, 7 and 8, and the feature of claim 16.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 9, 2008